

Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/781,092	WIPPERSTEG ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Suzanne Lo	2128	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Suzanne Lo. (3) _____

(2) Eli Borosky. (4) _____

Date of Interview: 16 January 2008.

Type: a) ☐ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
c) ☒ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.
If Yes, brief description: _____

Claim(s) discussed: 1.

Identification of prior art discussed: Weigelt (U.S. Patent No. 5,712,782) and Bicshoff (U.S. Patent No. 5,712,782).


Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☒ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

 SPE AU 2128
 Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Applicant presented proposed claimed amendments. Applicant clarified the last step of claim 1 reads as using the optimized adjustable parameters for indication to an operator or using the optimized adjustable parameters for adjustment of the at least one machine. The Examiner advised the Applicant of 112, 2nd issue regarding the phrase "selecting a situation apttern which comes close...to an instantaneous situation pattern". The Examiner also request that Applicants provide support for the limitations "situation pattern" and "coming close or is identical to an instantaneous situation pattern" from the specification of the instant application.